

REMARKS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated October 31, 2005. Claims 1 to 3, 5 to 7, 9 to 13 and 15 to 38 remain in the application, with Claims 4, 8 and 14 having been canceled herein. Claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 27, 37 and 38 are the independent claims herein. Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, 5, 7 to 9, 11, 14 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,172,111 (Olivo), Claims 17 to 20, 22, 23, 26 to 30, 32, 33 and 36 to 38 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Olivo in view of Official Notice, Claims 2, 3, 12, 13, 24, 24, 34 and 35 were rejected under § 103(a) over Olivo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,377,309 (Ito), and Claims 6, 10, 16, 21 and 31 were rejected under § 103(a) over Olivo in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,744,968 (Imai). Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The present invention concerns reproducing a recorded digital data stream by replacing an object in the data stream. According to one aspect of the invention as claimed in Claims 1, 7, 11 and 37, a determination is made whether an object with a real-time attribute exists in the recorded data stream. A selection is made, based on a user's designation, whether or not to display the object having the real-time attribute, and a new object is generated based on real-time information at a current time corresponding to a type of the object that is selected not to be displayed. Then, when the recorded digital data stream is reproduced, if a selection is made not to display the object having the real-time attribute and it is determined that the object having the real-time attribute exists, the object having the real-time attribute is replaced with the generated new object.

With specific reference to the claims, amended independent Claim 1 is an

image processing apparatus for reproducing a recorded digital data stream, comprising determination means for determining whether an object having a real-time attribute exists in the recorded digital data stream, selection means for selecting whether or not to display the object having the real-time attribute, based on a designation of a user, generation means for generating a new object based on real-time information at a current time corresponding to a type of the object that is selected not to be displayed by the selection means, and reproducing means for reproducing the recorded digital data stream while replacing the object having the real-time attribute with the new object generated by the generation means, in a case where the selection means selects not to display the object having the real-time attribute and the determination means determines that the object having the real-time attribute exists.

Amended independent Claim 7 is an apparatus claim, amended independent Claim 11 is a method claim, and amended independent Claim 37 is a computer medium claim, each of which substantially correspond to Claim 1.

Amended independent Claim 17 includes features along the lines of Claim 1, but is more specifically directed to an image processing apparatus for reproducing a recorded digital data stream, comprising determination means for determining whether an object having a super-imposed attribute exists in the recorded digital data stream, designation means for designating a reproducing form of the object having the super-imposed attribute from a plurality of reproducing forms, generation means for generating a predetermined icon corresponding to a type of the object having the super-imposed attribute; and reproducing control means for reproducing the recorded digital data stream while replacing the object having the super-imposed attribute with the predetermined icon generated by the generation means, in a case where the designation means designates a

predetermined reproducing form in which the object having the super-imposed attribute is not to be displayed and the determination means determines that the object having the super-imposed attribute exists.

Amended independent Claim 27 is a method claim and amended independent Claim 38 is a computer medium claim, each of which substantially corresponds to Claim 27.

The applied art, alone or in any permissible combination, is not seen to disclose or to suggest the features of the present invention. In particular, with regard to Claims 1, 7, 11 and 37, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of reproducing a recorded digital data stream while replacing an object having a real-time attribute with a new object generated based on real-time information at a current time corresponding to a type of the object selected not to be displayed, in a case where a selection is made, based on a user designation, not to display the object having the real-time attribute and a determination is made that the object having the real-time attribute exists in the recorded digital data stream. Similarly, with regard to Claims 17, 27 and 38, the applied art is not seen to disclose or to suggest at least the feature of reproducing a recorded digital data stream while replacing an object having a super-imposed attribute with a predetermined icon generated corresponding to a type of the object having the super-imposed attribute, in a case where a predetermined reproducing form is designated in which the object having the super-imposed attribute is not to be displayed, and a determination is made that the object having the super-imposed attribute exists in the recorded digital data stream.

Olivo is merely seen to disclose a stored media screening device which can automatically and selectively prevent the reproduction into human perceivable form of

unwanted program material. In column 7 of Olivo, an operator can select not to replay a program of a predetermined MCS. Fig. 2B shows a case where a replay of the program of the predetermined MCS is prevented or altered (shown at 159 by the playback device 11), if the operator sets not to display the program. Thus, according to Olivo, it is possible to prevent the display of the whole program or a part of the program.

In contrast, according to the present invention of Claims 1, 7, 11 and 37, it is possible to determine an object having a real-time attribute, and to replace the object in a reproduced data stream with a new object generated based on real-time information at a current time corresponding to a type of the object. Likewise, according to the present invention of Claims 17, 27 and 38, it is possible to determine an object having a superimposed attribute, and to replace the object in a reproduced data stream with a predetermined icon generated corresponding to a type of the object. Olivo simply fails to disclose or to suggest either of the foregoing features.

Ito and Imai are not seen to add anything to overcome the deficiencies of Olivo. In this regard, Ito is merely seen to disclose a TV broadcasting system using MPEG 4 and MPEG 2, while Imai is merely seen to disclose an editing system for editing clips, including time management. However, neither Ito or Imai are seen to disclose or to suggest anything that would have overcome the deficiencies of Olivo. More particularly, Ito and Imai are not seen to add anything that, when combined with Olivo, would have resulted in reproducing a recorded digital data stream while replacing an object having a real-time attribute with a new object generated based on real-time information at a current time corresponding to a type of the object selected not to be displayed, in a case where a selection is made, based on a user designation, not to display the object having the real-time attribute and a determination is made that the object having the real-time attribute

exists in the recorded digital data stream (Claims 1, 7, 11 and 27), or reproducing a recorded digital data stream while replacing an object having a super-imposed attribute with a predetermined icon generated corresponding to a type of the object having the super-imposed attribute, in a case where a predetermined reproducing form is designated in which the object having the super-imposed attribute is not to be displayed, and a determination is made that the object having the super-imposed attribute exists in the recorded digital data stream (Claims 17, 27 and 38).

Regarding the Official Notice, while displaying icons may in fact be old and well known, the invention does not merely display icons, but rather, replaces an object having a super-imposed attribute with a predetermined icon generated corresponding to a type of the object in accordance with a selected reproducing form. Thus, the Official Notice is traversed insofar as it fails to teach features of the invention.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, amended independent Claims 1, 7, 11, 17, 27, 37 and 38, as well as the claims dependent therefrom, are believed to be allowable.

No other matters having been raised, the entire application is believed to be in condition for allowance and such action is respectfully requested at the Examiner's earliest convenience.

Applicants' undersigned attorney may be reached in our Costa Mesa, California office at (714) 540-8700. All correspondence should continue to be directed to our below-listed address.

Respectfully submitted,

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
Attorney for Applicants  
Edward A. Kmett  
Attorney Registration No.: 42,746

FITZPATRICK, CELLA, HARPER & SCINTO  
30 Rockefeller Plaza  
New York, New York 10112-2200  
Facsimile: (212) 218-2200

CA\_MAIN 108740v1